



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27298
Title of the Manuscript:	Clostridium Difficile infection in immunocompromised and non-immunocompromised Hosts – a single-center Experience
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: Clostridium Difficile – this is written as <i>Clostridium difficile</i> (in italics, <i>C. difficile</i>) and should be so throughout the paper Line 17, the phrase is “accounting for...”, not “accounting to...” Line 26 – 28 The concluding statement in conclusion is not clear Line 53, “was reported” is a better expression than “has been reported” Line 57, rephrase to “... patients who presented with CD-associated diarrhea...” Line 64 Insert the word “who” for the sentence to read “Patients who tested positive...” by PCR test.....” Line 66 – 67; Rephrase the sentence to read “Approval for the study was granted by the local ethics committee of the institution”. Line 80 – 81; “.....only the first episode was counted and included in the analysis”. Line 89 Rephrase to read “... no antibiotic treatment for CDI or died within six days of treatment were not included in the study”. Laboratory Assay, lines 107 – 111. What is written under this section of the write up has to reflect that the study was retrospective. And so the authors have to report that the laboratory analysis was what was usually performed by the Lab staff. It should not be construed or made to seem as if that is what the authors did.	Thank you for your comments 1. Line 17 Corrected 2. Line 26-28 , Statement amended 3. Line 53, Corrected 4. Line 57, Corrected 5. Line 64. corrected 6. Line 64, 7. Line 66-67, corrected 8. Line 80-81, corrected 9. Line 89 corrected. 10. Line 111, Amended as suggested 11. Line 123. Amended 12. Line 139, 143. Corrected 13. Line 150. Corrected 14. ‘Large’ deleted 15. Line 193-195 repharsed 16. Line 268, ‘Sample size estimation’ added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 123 should be rephrased to read as follows “ A total of 280 patients were noted to have tested positive for <i>C. difficile</i> (toxigenic) by PCR lab test from.....”. Line 139; When an abbreviated word is being used for the first time, it should be written in full e.g. PPI Proton pump inhibitor; line 143 -CKD – chronic kidney disease. Line 150 change the word “was” to “were” Discussion The authors’ description of the study as “large retrospective cohort study” is a misnomer. What will authors refers to studies where numbers analysed is more than 5,000 to 15,000? Please rephrase sentence on lines 193-195. Line 268. I do not agree with authors that this was a study with adequate sample size. For the mean fact that it was retrospective, highly invalidates the data collection.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Authors should let someone whose first language in English to proof the paper. 2. Some cited references were off key. Authors should clearly indicate limitations associated with a study like this – retrospective study	Limitations of the study has been discussed from line 259-267